REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending in this application, of which claims 1-2 and 4-5 have been amended, and claims 6-9 were previously withdrawn. No new claims have been added.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,011,239 to Singh et al. (hereafter "**Singh et al**") in view of U.S. Patent 4,691,241 to Tomohisa et al. (hereafter "**Tomohisa et al**") and U.S. Patent 5,622,567 to Kojima et al. (hereafter "**Kojima et al**")

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Singh et al discloses an apparatus and method for automatically adjusting the gram load and static attitude in a head suspension assembly comprising one or more lasers, a fiber optic switch, a measurement apparatus and a computer control means. The fiber optic switch includes a plurality of fiber optic lines which direct the output of the laser to well-defined regions on the suspensions in a disk drive. Irradiation of the suspension by the laser causes a load change which alters the static attitude change in the slider.

Tomohisa et al. discloses a method and system for compensating for a shading phenomenon. An image signal of the input and/or the output side is (are) multiplied by a shading compensation signal obtained from the output signal of a low-pass filter employed in a PLL circuit or a grating signal multiplying means.

Kojima et al. discloses a thin film forming apparatus using a laser including a chamber, a target placed therein, a laser light source for emitting a laser beam to a target, and a substrate holder. When the target is irradiated with the laser beam, a plume is generated and materials included in the plume are deposited on the surface of a substrate, held by a substrate holder. The laser beam emitted from the laser light source has its cross section shaped to a desired shape when passed through a shielding plate, for example, so that the surface of the target is irradiated with the beam having uniform light intensity distribution.

None of the cited references teaches, mentions or suggests that the laser beam is a combined shape of characters, as in the present invention.

Accordingly, claims 1-2 have been amended to clarify this distinction.

As noted Applicants' previous response with regard to **Matsushita `604**, none of the cited references teaches, mentions or suggests "selecting an irradiation shape combination corresponding to either one of or both the load adjustment amount and the angle adjustment amount" as recited in claim 3.

As noted in Applicants' previous response with regard to **Matsushita `604**, none of the cited references teaches, mentions or suggests "an XY axis is set around the head mounting portion, an area I to an area IV are formed on the XY coordinates with the X axis as a gimbal longitudinal direction, and the laser beam irradiation area for correcting the angle in plus or the laser beam irradiation area for correcting the angle in minus is set in the area I and the area III or the area II and the area IV respectively", as recited in claim 4.

As noted in Applicants' previous response with regard to **Matsushita `604**, none of the cited references teaches, mentions or suggests "a boundary is provided in a direction orthogonal with a gimbal longitudinal direction around the spring, a first area is formed at the head mounting side, a second area is formed at the opposite side, the laser beam irradiation area for correcting the pitch angle in plus is set in the first area, and the laser beam irradiation area for correction the pitch angle in minus in the second area" as recited in claim 5.

It is noted that these limitations distinguishing the present invention, as recited in claims 3-5, as argued in our last response, are not even addressed by the Examine in this rejection.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as unpatentable over **Singh et al.** in view of **Tomohisa et al.** and **Kojima et al.** and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,086,773 to Dufresne et al. (hereafter "**Dufresne et al.**")

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Dufresne et al. discloses a process for the manufacture of flexible tubular elements, particularly stents for the medical field, the process comprising the steps of:

a) providing a hollow metal tube (or metal coated tube) with an open pattern of a chemical-etch-resistant coating layer;

b) supporting the hollow metal tube with a coating thereon onto a chemical etch resistant support element;

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 12 2007

c) contacting the open pattern with a solution capable of etching the metal of the hollow metal tube so that said metal is etched away from physically exposed surfaces of the metal tube and openings in the metal tube corresponding to the open pattern of the coating layer are created in the metal tube element without etching the chemical etch resistant support element; and

d) removing the metal tube from the chemical etch resistant support element.

Dufresne et al. has been cited for teaching "the precise pattern needed" for the laser beam but, like the other references cited by the Examiner, fails to teach, mention or suggest "selecting an irradiation shape combination corresponding to either one of or both the load adjustment amount and the angle adjustment amount," as recited in claim 3.

In view of the aforementioned amendment and accompanying remarks, claims 1-2 and 4-5, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 04-1105.

Respectfully submitted,

EDWARDS, ANGELL, PALMER & DODGE, LLP

William L. Brooks
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,129

Atty. Docket No. 302764-80434
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205
(202) 659-2930

21874
21874
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

DC 232692.1